



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

7. In bringing the peace-men and the war-men of Christendom fully to an issue ; the friends and the enemies, the supporters and the opponents, of its present war-system, into direct, open, avowed conflict, not upon barren abstractions, but upon plain, practical realities ; upon the questions, whether this system shall be continued, or superseded ; whether nations shall still employ the worse than brutal logic of lead and steel, or law and reason and Christian principle, for the settlement of their disputes. On the issue thus fairly presented, we find far more on our side than the world had supposed.

8. In thus launching upon all Christendom the discussion of the peace question as one of the grand issues or problems of the age. The general mind cannot now help looking at this subject ; and due consideration of it must, sooner or later, insure all we want. We have set the world to thinking and talking, to writing and publishing on the question of peace, tenfold more than they did fifty or twenty years ago ; and this process, if continued long enough, will of itself work out, under God, the glorious results we seek.

9. In enlisting for our cause not a few very important agencies and influences that were before either opposed, or indifferent and inactive.

10. In getting men of every creed in religion, and every party in politics, from different and widely distant countries, republicans and monarchists, Catholics and Protestants, philosophers and statesmen, men of business, and men of science and letters, to agree with perfect unanimity upon a set of principles and measures, sufficient, if once carried into effect, to prevent all war, and uproot forever the whole war-system. Here is a very significant and most hopeful fact, itself alone worth all the time, and money, and effort which these successive Congresses have cost.

FOURTH PEACE CONGRESS,

AT FRANKFORT, GERMANY.

Our readers already know the general facts respecting this Congress ; but, as our periodical is designed to be a record of whatever is done for the cause of peace, and as this demonstration in its behalf is deemed decidedly successful by those who witnessed it, we shall chronicle its leading details, as important for future reference, and likely to interest our friends. We very much regret our inability to give the *debates* of the Congress in a fuller, more life-like form ; but we shall do the best we can with the comparatively meagre, though doubtless accurate report we have received.

CALL OF THE CONGRESS.—The Congress at Paris in August of 1849, having voted to hold another the present year in Germany, referred all the requisite preliminaries to the Peace Congress Committee in London, composed of the leading members of the London Peace Society. This Committee

selected, at the request of our German friends, Frankfort on-the-Maine, as the place for the Congress, and accordingly issued in due time their invitation for the attendance of delegates from all parts of the civilized world, without distinction of country, sect or party, on the sole condition of their being opposed to the custom of war, as unchristian, as well as inexpedient, and in favor of superseding it by rational, peaceful substitutes.

Mr. Burritt, after his return to this country, visited, on behalf of the American Peace Congress Committee, nearly all the Free, and some of the Slave States, to awaken an interest in the subject, and secure delegates to the proposed Congress. He visited, on one extreme, the Capitols of Maine and Vermont, and on the other, Missouri, Illinois, and Wisconsin. In England the subject was so familiar, and the place of the Congress so easy of access, that the London Committee found no need of special meetings to procure delegates, but rallied a large delegation by a mere circular issued just before the Congress convened.

PRELIMINARIES TO THE CONGRESS. — Some two months before the Congress was to be held, Rev. Henry Richard, Secretary of the London Peace Society, and Elihu Burritt, started from London for a tour of preparation on the Continent, with a view not only to make local arrangements at Frankfort, but to visit important places, and interest prominent men in the movement. On their arrival in Frankfort, they were singularly happy in finding as their first counsellor and fellow-laborer, a gentleman most eminently qualified for this duty in every respect. We allude to Dr. Varrentrapp. Associated with him, as the Local Committee, were nine other gentlemen, with whose names the friends of peace in England ought to be made familiar, for they have rendered services to our sacred cause which we cannot too highly appreciate. These were Mr. Philip de Bary, an eminent banker of Frankfort; Rev. L. Bonnet, Minister of the French Reformed Church; Dr. Carove, of Heidelberg; Dr. I. M. Jost, President of the Jewish Industrial College; Rev. Dr. K. M. Krichner, Minister of the Lutheran Church; Rev. L. Schrader, Minister of the German Reformed Church; Dr. Edward Souchay, for many years a leading member of the Frankfort Senate; Dr. G. A. Spiess, a physician of great eminence; and Mr. H. A. Wedewer, inspector of the Catholic Selekten Schule. It will be observed, that there is here a representative of every religious party; and it is surely a most gratifying fact, that there is at least one great interest, around which men of all political and theological sentiments can gather, and work together with the most perfect harmony.

It was not long before the English deputation, aided by these gentlemen, succeeded in putting matters in favorable train at Frankfort. The authorization of the Senate was promptly accorded; and through the kindness of Dr. F. Jucho, and the Lutheran Consistory, the use of St. Paul's Church was obtained as the place of meeting; while the circular of invitation, accompanied by a special letter from the Local Committee, was soon prepared, and sent forth in large numbers through every part of Germany. The preparatory arrangements having been thus happily advanced, the English deputation felt themselves at liberty to start on a kind of missionary tour to the north of Germany, being fully convinced that there were no means so effectual for diffusing information and awakening interest and sympathy in the coming Congress, and in the Peace question generally, as by personal visitation. They had the happiness of being joined in this excursion by M. Visschers, whose unwearied devotedness to the cause merits the warm gratitude of every friend of peace, and whose presence and co-operation were of the highest value throughout the whole journey.

Our space will not admit of any detailed account of this tour, though it was full of interest, and likely to produce important and enduring results. Suffice it to say, that the deputation, now representing the English, American and Belgian Committees, visited in succession many of the principal towns and cities of the north, where they had access to scores of men of the highest intelligence, influence and character. With scarcely an exception, they were everywhere received not only with respect, but with that earnest and unreserved cordiality which is one of the most delightful characteristics of our German neighbors. Men who had occupied, or were then occupying, distinguished political positions; professors at the Universities, who had hundreds of young men under their care; authors, whose renown is as wide as the world; ministers of religion, of every denomination; and editors of newspapers and periodicals, of the largest circulation and influence, were among those who listened with the kindest attention and discussed with evident interest, the principles and projects of Peace, which the deputation attempted to develop. By these conversations, and by the opportunity afforded of putting into the hands of such men the publications of the Congress, the attention of some of the greatest minds in Germany has been directed to the subject, not, it is hoped, without permanent, practical results. After returning to Frankfort, and remaining there for some days, to complete the local preparations, Messrs. Burritt and Richard made another tour into the south of Germany, visiting Bamberg, Nuremberg, Augsburg, Munich, Ulm, Stuttgart, &c., where they saw many eminent and excellent men, some of whom displayed the deepest interest in the object of their mission.

Meanwhile, M. Visschers, at Brussels, and M. Garnier, at Paris, were using diligent exertions, by a wide distribution of the circular, and other means, to procure respectable and influential delegations to the Congress from Belgium and France. As the time approached, and every post from England brought tidings that the number of those proposing to come to the Congress was increasing day by day, it became a matter of serious anxiety how to find suitable accommodations for so large a body, just at the time when, from a variety of causes, Frankfort was already overflowing with strangers. By careful inquiry, however, in every part of the city, and the hearty co-operation of the Local Committee, arrangements were at length made, by which adequate provision was secured for the whole party.

JOURNEY TO THE CONGRESS. — Nearly the entire deputation from England and America went together by a special conveyance of cars and steamers, from London to Frankfort, and were, as an act of very unusual courtesy and respect, allowed to pass through France, Belgium and Prussia, without passports, or examination of their baggage; an exemption the value of which can be duly estimated only by those who have travelled on the Continent, and been at every turn subjected, as all ordinary travellers are, to the vexatious inquisitions of the police and custom-house. We will not describe the journey of these peace-makers, but will quote the following from one of their number: —

“The progress up the Rhine was, as might be expected, one of surpassing interest and gratification. With every turn of that famous river, some new scene of beauty, or some unlooked-for combination of natural objects, arrested the attention, and excited the admiration, of the passengers. The grandeur of the mountains; the sweetness of the valleys, as they stretched away and were lost in the distance; the quiet, industrious aspect of the towns, and the rural simplicity of the villages; with the high state of culti-

vation of the lands, even to the tops of the mountains, presented themes of attraction so varied, so new, and withal so incessant, that none of the party will ever forget the day, nor the impressions of delight of which they were the subjects. It was worth all the fatigue of the previous journey to witness the scene; but to enjoy it on such an occasion, and in connection with so great an object, made it doubly delightful. The ruined castles which crown nearly every height, could not fail to suggest to the reflecting friends of Universal Peace, that as those mouldering remnants of one warlike age served as sepulchres to its departed genius, so, before long, would Ehrenbreitstein be the mausoleum of another; and as the fiery barons that once issued from those halls to *defend* their lands, had perished from the scene, and passed for ever away; so would the sleeker warrior of more modern times. The progress of civilization has superseded the one; and the advance of Christianity among the nations will as infallibly destroy the other. Happy that man who takes his part, and performs it well, in this great achievement; who, while looking on such scenes as a lover of nature, yet penetrates beneath the surface, detecting the hidden principles that converted these scenes to the purposes of a barbarous chivalry, and resolves, that as far as he is concerned, in an humble dependence on the Divine blessing, he will do his very utmost to make the future 'better than the past!' The life of such a man is as gold in the intercourse of mankind; and when the shades of evening gather around his course, to him will be imparted the privileged conviction that he has not lived in vain.

On Thursday morning, August 22d, the Congress commenced its memorable sittings. But before we proceed to any record of the proceedings, we beg the indulgence of our readers while describing, in a few words, the appearance of the building, &c., in which the delegates and visitors were about to assemble.

The City of Frankfort merits a passing notice. It is situated at the base of the Taunus chain of mountains, and is a most agreeable city, with a considerable proportion of spacious streets, containing shops that would do honor to any European metropolis. It was formerly an Imperial town, and the place where several of the Roman emperors were elected. In its vicinity considerable traces of the Romans are yet to be seen. It has ten principal gates, which, prior to the demolition of the fortifications from 1806 to 1812, had gloomy towers that frowned terrifically on all who passed in or out of the city. These dark and threatening entrances have been replaced by elegant barriers, of modern architecture; and the charming promenades, where the inhabitants now enjoy ample recreation, cover the ground once occupied by the danger-inviting walls of defence. Charlemagne had an Imperial Palace in this city, which stood on the spot now occupied by the church of St. Leonard; but no traces whatever remain of the once famous abode of that celebrated prince.

The constitution of the town, as established October 18, 1816, after the overthrow of Napoleon, who had despotically deprived the place of its liberty, is a temperate Democracy. The supreme government rests in the body of townsmen professing the Christian religion, and is exercised by three powers—the Senate, the Council of Representatives, and the Legislative body. This power of self-government, this independence of foreign control, has made the place an object of perpetual distrust and suspicion to the northern Absolutists; and it is this alone that has led them to seek (much too successfully) the office of guarding and *protecting* the liberties of the inhabitants.

Frankfort contains several buildings worthy of note; but the most handsome, and nearly the most modern among them, is St. Paul's Church. This noble structure, which is of freestone, was begun in 1788; but during the wars it was relinquished, and for a time converted into a warehouse; from

which degradation the return of peace raised it to its present beautiful position and appearance. It is one hundred and thirty-two feet in length, and one hundred and eight in width, thus forming an oval of elegant proportions. It has also a remarkably fine organ.

This was the edifice appropriated, by the extreme kindness of the Frankfort Lutheran Consistory, to the sittings of the Peace Congress; and while acknowledging the generosity of the above ecclesiastical body, it detracts nothing from the meed of praise we readily award, to say, that never was that venerated and hallowed building more appropriately employed than by the deliberations of the friends of Universal Peace. That edifice had been the scene of the struggles for German unity and independence. The voice of eloquence, of argument, and pathos, had reverberated round those spacious walls, in defence of rights which only tyranny denied, and an armed despotism sought to suppress. There the patriot and the philosopher asserted the principles, or illustrated the theories of the people's right to govern by a responsible executive; and there, too, had the indignant advocate of the insulted masses hurled defiance at the heads of rulers who maintained their power by the sword, to the utter disregard of justice. But, important and sacred as were these scenes, with all their imposing and attractive appendages of local and German association, they were not superior, if indeed equal, to the gravity, interest and importance, of the discussions of the Peace Congress. The former were noble struggles to effect a grand *Germanic* union; the latter aimed to unite the whole world. The one labored to destroy a particular despotism of local extent, and of partial oppressiveness; the other to undermine the foundation of *all* despotisms by destroying the power of the sword. The first were directed to the emancipation from political degradation of some forty millions of the Germanic people; the last labored to effect the elevation and permanent happiness of the whole race of mankind. Consecrated and hallowed as that building must have become by all that the German people witnessed within its walls, it will now be regarded as doubly so, from the superior gravity of the cause of whose labors it has been so lately the repository. And if the reflecting German entertains a pardonable pride at the associations of that edifice with the spirited but abortive efforts to obtain his national independence, he will feel no less so at the recollection, that within those sacred walls some of the first men in Europe have advocated the cause of Universal Peace.

No stranger could have walked through the streets of Frankfort on the morning of the 22d of August, without encountering numerous proofs that something unusual, yet interesting and important, was about to take place. The number of well-dressed, earnest-looking and serious foreigners that were wending their way to one particular point; the larger number of equally respectable inhabitants of Frankfort, with the grave and venerable personages that had arrived, or were arriving, from other parts of Germany, all making to the same central object of attraction; and the curiosity of the people generally, considerable bodies of whom had collected in detached crowds at the fitting quarters for observation; must have convinced the most superficial, that there was a scene *somewhere*, not of idle recreation, but of grave and serious import, about to take place. And if he had followed in the wake of those who thronged the way to the open space in Paul's Platz, the crowds assembled there with countenances that betokened the most intense interest, and in all the attitudes into which eager anxiety or curiosity could throw them, would have explained in a moment that in the conspicuous and noble building *there*, all their interest and expectations centred. Then the thronging about the doors, the urgent and continuous demand for tickets of admission—especially around the entrance of the office of the Frankfort Committee, where the throng was so great, that the pressing

through it endangered more than the garments of the present writer; the disappointed aspect of some countenances, and the more than gratification that spread over others who had been successful in securing the means of entrance, combined to form a scene that those who witnessed it can never forget; and that because it exhibited proofs of the highest degree of interest of which our common humanity is susceptible.

On entering the church, the spectator must have been struck with the magnificence, not to say gorgeousness of the spectacle. The beauty of the building; the animation displayed by the gratified numbers who had succeeded in obtaining access to the visitors' seats, the grave and earnest aspect of the delegates, with the marked and varied expression of the English, American, and German physiognomies, and the quiet but systematic activity of the officials, presented a scene, to any reflecting beholder, of surpassing interest; one, indeed, never to be forgotten by a mind habituated to connect the future with the present, and to trace out distant consequences from causes passing before the eye. It was a gathering together, an active collection of living principles, whose aspirations and demands were about to be embodied in eloquent sentiment, which, threading its way through the press, the senate and the pulpit, is destined to the final subjugation of the world."

ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS. — *President*, HERR JAUP. *Vice-Presidents*—Rev. L. BONNET, for Germany; M. de CORMENIN, and M. de GIRARDIN, for France; M. VISSCHERS, for Belgium; RICHARD COBDEN, M. P., and CHARLES HINDLEY, M. P., for England; EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D. D., LL. D., and E. B. HALL, D. D., for America. *Secretaries*—Dr. VARRENTRAPP, and Dr. CREIZENACH, for Germany; M. J. GAMIER, and Rev. A. COQUEREL, Jun., for France; Rev. H. RICHARD, and Rev. W. STOKES, for England; E. BURRITT, and Prof. C. D. CLEVELAND, for America.

NUMBER OF DELEGATES. — We cannot give the precise number, but suppose from all the accounts received, they must have reached nearly a thousand. There was also a large number of spectators; and such was their enthusiasm, that the writer before us says, "The avenues of approach were besieged with eager claimants for admission at the second day of meeting; and the door of the office of the Frankfort Committee was so beset as to prevent ingress or egress by the ordinary way, and a side door was therefore used for this purpose. So great was the anxiety of the crowd to obtain the German tracts which Mr. Stokes was distributing in considerable numbers, that, as a matter of prudence, if not of escape from danger, he was obliged to betake himself to the interior of the building, and to leave the crowd outside. One side of the large square presented a most animating scene; and the increased numbers assembled there were proofs, among many others that Frankfort furnished, of the great interest felt by its inhabitants in the Congress."

The PRESIDENT, HERR JAUP, late Prime Minister of Hesse-Darmstadt, then opened his address by saying, that he accepted with thankfulness the invitation given to him to preside over such an important assembly. In doing so, he would, in the name of his countrymen, welcome them all to attend the first Peace Congress held on the soil of Germany. Hitherto, Germany had not taken a very active part in this great movement; but the presence of that large assembly proved that it was beginning to feel a deep interest in the question.

He then detailed shortly the history of this movement, from its first origin in England and America, and alluded to the Congresses which had been held in Brussels and Paris, and to the present gathering in the ancient city of Frankfort. Many men, he continued, regarded the great matter to which

their attention was about to be drawn as Utopian ; but all measures for the progress of the world had at first been equally received with distrust. In order to accomplish the ends which they had in view, public opinion must be roused, and made to act upon the governments and the legislatures of the various countries in the world ; and public opinion, as the great moving power, must ultimately prevail.

He then read the regulations by which it was proposed that the Congress should be governed ; and these having been put to the meeting, and agreed to, letters were handed in from persons favorable to the objects of the Congress, but unable to attend in person. One was read from M. Victor Hugo, the President of the Congress last year in Paris.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONGRESS. — These were of course passed at different times during the session of three days ; but we group them all together here for convenient reference. They elicited much discussion ; but it is quite remarkable, that they were all adopted with entire unanimity.

1. "The Congress of the friends of Universal Peace, assembled at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, the 22d, 23d, and 24th August, 1850, acknowledges that, 'recourse to arms being condemned alike by religion, morality, reason and humanity, it is the duty of all men to adopt measures calculated to abolish war ;' and the Congress recommends all its members to labor in their respective countries, by means of a better education of youth, by the pulpit, the platform, and the press, as well as by other practical methods, to eradicate those hereditary hatreds, and political and commercial prejudices, which have been so generally the cause of disastrous wars.

2. "This Congress is of opinion, that one of the most effectual means of preserving Peace, would be for governments to refer to arbitration all those differences between them which cannot be otherwise amicably settled.

3. "That the standing armaments with which the governments of Europe menace one another, impose intolerable burdens, and inflict grievous moral and social evils upon their respective communities : This Congress cannot, therefore, too earnestly call the attention of governments to the necessity of entering upon a system of international disarmament, without prejudice to such measures as may be considered necessary for the maintenance of the security of the citizens, and of the internal tranquillity of each state.

4. "This Congress reiterates its strong disapprobation of all foreign loans, negotiated for the purpose of furnishing to one people the means of slaughtering another.

5. "That this Congress, acknowledging the principles of non-intervention, recognises it to be the sole right of every state to regulate its own affairs.

6. "That this Congress recommends all the friends of Peace to prepare public opinion in their respective countries, for the convocation of a Congress of the Representatives of the various States, with a view to the formation of a Code of International Law.

7. "The Congress condemns the practice of duelling between individuals equally with war between nations ; and every person joining this society binds himself not to be a party to a duel, and ceases to be a member if he violates the pledge."

EXTRACTS FROM THE SPEECHES.

REV. JOHN BURNET, from London. — On ascending the tribune, he was received with loud applause, and proceeded to say that this was not the thunder of war, but the thunder of peace, — a thunder which the most sensitive nerve was always able to bear. Were it the thunder of war, he

would rather die amid the blaze of the conflict, than lift an arm to give the victory to either party.

They were assembled, very appropriately, within the walls of the Parliament House of Germany; and to the Municipality of Frankfort were they most deeply indebted, that there, amid these walls, in a building consecrated to discussion, could they raise the voice and the banner of Peace. He would not deign to refer to the different nations who appeared by their representatives in that Congress; for they really belonged to no nation, because they held out the hand of friendship to all. Their mission was related to humanity, to the one great family of man, and not to any one branch of that great family to the prejudice of any other branch. Reason was given to man, not to invent instruments for the destruction of one another, but to adjust misunderstanding by intelligence and wisdom.

In uttering such truths, however, they were taunted with only being well-meaning enthusiasts. They were admitted to be well-meaning. No one pretended that war was well, — that murder or bloodshed was a good thing. Those who called them enthusiasts, did not stop to inquire into the meaning of the word. Enthusiasm was a restless state of mind, preventing the harmonious action of the faculties of our nature. The battle-field was, therefore, the scene of enthusiasm. It was the rage of passion, instead of the harmonious development of the mind, — a mad, feverish contention. But the assembly he addressed betrayed no symptoms of such a disorder. All the minds before him appeared calm and composed, but at the same time determined to go on until they had given out to the whole world the great doctrine, that nations should not fall upon one another with the sword, but adjust their disputes by arbitration.

It was for the accomplishment of this great object, that the Congress had been called together; and he showed the impolicy of mixing up the question with political considerations. They had no right to meddle with the agitations of Germany, or seek to settle the politics of Europe; but they came together to submit considerations for universal peace and good-will throughout the world. And if for a moment they departed from this great design, well might the Congress be derided by the public press. They came together to establish reason and judgment among men, — not to ask nations to settle their quarrels by a fight. The question as to which nation was the strongest, was settled by the collision; but a glance of the eye would have settled this without a bloody field.

But how were the Peacemakers of that Congress to gain their end? By going on until all the capitals of Europe heard their voice, and understood their mission, and the cities of America too, — until all ranks of men, ay, even the ranks of the army, were restored to a right state of mind. The school, the pulpit, the platform, and the press, were the machinery for the accomplishment of this mighty purpose, and these were weapons more powerful than cannon. A single round of cheering was better than twenty rounds of cannon, for the cheers came from the human heart. He alluded particularly to the power of the press. The press had sometimes spoken against, and sometimes spoken for him; sometimes they mended their speeches, and sometimes they spoiled them; but, altogether, it had done justice to the cause of humanity.

M. DE CORMENIN, member of the French National Assembly, and formerly Councillor of State. — As you kindly permit me to address you on the subject of Peace, I should have preferred doing so in the name of the noble and generous nation to which I have the happiness of belonging. Unfortunately, this mission has not been committed to me; and while I am addressing this august assembly, I even feel my nationality oozing out, and being fast absorbed into it. We are, in fact, only children of one great family of the human race. We are all brethren.

Why shall we not confess, my friends, that the cause of Peace, like all other great causes, has most enterprising detractors? They tell us "we are drugged with *Utopianism*; that we are *Utopianized*." The most indulgent amongst them consider us simply as dreamers; but the majority whisper to one another, that we are a very remarkable set of fools and maniacs.

Now, if by way of reprisal, I chose to allow misanthropy to get the upper hand of me, I would reply that the most formidable obstacle to the abolition of war exists in the fact, that war is an absurdity, and that by some strange fatality, absurdities have, up to the present day, enjoyed the privilege of governing the world. I will, however, content myself with observing, that if Peace is a Utopia, so is religion, so is virtue, so is justice, so is love, so is humanity. Therefore, unless we maintain that religion is infinitely below atheism, virtue below vice, justice beneath iniquity, love inferior to hate, I cannot see how it can be maintained that peace is not better than war. But if peace be better than war, I say that it is rational to force peace, to put down war. On the other hand, if war be a necessary evil, as some assert, I in turn maintain that there is an evil even yet more necessary than war, — I mean death; and that it is not exacting too much to require that each of us shall, to prevent war, make the smallest of those efforts which every one of us is in the habit of making to escape from death.

It must be admitted that, up to the present day, the question we are agitating has remained shut up in the seventh heaven of philosophers and moralists; but I for one — though I think it very well where it is — do not the less believe that the day has come when we must call it down from those heights, and compel it to take up its abode upon more accessible elevations. Let it come down, I say, to the vulgar level of positive and daily interests. Why, up to the present moment, the question of war has been brought only before governments which command it; before legislatures which vote for it; before generals who make it; before commercial men who profit by it; and before poets who chant its praises. The time is come, I think, for it to be brought before the *masses who pay for it*. The time is come for the *tax-payers*, who are bled for its support, both in body and in purse, to ask one another, whether five hundred millions, expended in the purchase of plumes and cannon, is not a rather dear and unprofitable bargain; and whether they could not, without much difficulty, find some better investment for their money? Ask yourselves this question, my friends, not at the *court* and in the *palace*, not in the *saloon*, not in the *Parliament*, not even in *Peace Congresses*; but ask it often, every day, — ask it of the artisan in his workshop, of the peasant in his cottage. I need not tell you beforehand what their answer will be. After all, who and what are these artisans, and this peasantry? Are they not truly the people? Are they not really the army? And may we not say, in this case, that we have the army on our side? If this is so, I mean to assert that in this question of peace and war, it is no trifle to have "the army" with us.

One more objection has been frequently made, which we must not re-tort. It has been said, — and for a long time I myself held the same error — that, in order that the nations may win their liberties, they must have *one good war more — a good round one* — and have done with it! The last! why, history demonstrates that no sooner is one war over, so to speak, than you must immediately begin another to finish it; and that foreign wars serve only to increase the hatred of races, and intensify the brutality of the despotism of the sabre; to rivet upon the limbs of liberty the fetters of domestic oppression. My friends, since I witnessed the fall of the greatest warrior of modern times, and beheld our armies after they had invaded and ravaged your country, fall back upon the limits of their own, like a tempestuous flood, my illusions in favor of glory have been most complete-

ly dispelled; and on my way hither, I turned away my eyes from the battle-fields I was obliged to traverse, which have been so many times soaked with the blood of soldiers, men like unto ourselves, and watered with the scalding tears of widows and orphans.

In conclusion,—and mind, I do not address you thus, my German brethren, out of mere compliment for your hospitality, but from the bottom of my heart I exclaim,—may those frightful and useless combats which have so often desolated our respective countries never be renewed between us! but if our warlike folks at home *will* persist in visiting Germany, may they resolve to do so only in their holiday clothes, nor cross the Rhine except in pleasure-trains.

M. EMILE DE GIRARDIN, the great journalist of France, and now member of her National Assembly. — All this, say some, is merely Utopian. Is it not so? It may be called so; but it is not so, for practical men are here employed in bringing the matter to an issue. We have among us one man whose sentiments and ideas are, at all events, not Utopian — Richard Cobden. Are his ideas Utopian? I ask Europe if Richard Cobden is open to this charge?

Let us ask who have been regarded in Europe as the conquerors of other days. They are called Alexanders, Fredericks, and Napoleons; but the conquerors of our days are not so named. Their names are Fulton, Watt, Wilberforce, and such like. These are the names of our *modern* conquerors, who now make the tour of the world, and swamp the fame of others.

The world had its origin in unity. The Creator governs the world by unity, upon one great principle; and all governments must come to it. The Napoleon of Peace, as he was called, once predicted that they were on the eve of a great civil war, not the war of nations, and that civil war different from all which had preceded it; for it was the civil war of ideas. The history of the world, the history of its conquests, may be divided into three periods. The first period was that of passion and despotism; the second, that which involved the unity of states, and which had been solved by America; and the third is the unity of the people, of all people, which this Congress meets to promote.

And this great end will be accomplished, not more by lessons from the tribune, not more by the oratory of the pulpit, not more by the education of the people, than by science. The art of printing, additional facilities in the mode of travelling, greater intercourse in trade between nations and countries, and a better understanding of one another, must expedite liberty and justice. There cannot be two kinds of justice. There is only one kind of justice for the whole world. Depend upon it this great idea must expand — we must *expect* it to expand. It is a new policy which science is accomplishing. It establishes its victory by bringing people together; and the moment is approaching when not only nations, but the whole world, will be united under one idea — universal fraternity.

RICHARD COBDEN, the great practical Reformer and Statesman, spoke at some length on two subjects in particular, Arbitration and Disarmament.

ARBITRATION — It was not my intention to have addressed a word to this Conference to-day, having in reserve a few words upon another resolution to-morrow; but, the question of arbitration being the subject of discussion, and having taken some part elsewhere in the consideration of that question, and some dispute having been raised on the present occasion as to its practicability, I wish just to utter one or two words on the subject.

The resolution we propose to pass at present goes thus far, and no farther:

We say to the governments and diplomatists of the world, if you can find no other means of settling your differences, if all your attempted negotiations should have failed, if diplomacy confesses itself to have exhausted all its resources in vain, then we say, in preference to calling in the arbitrage of the sword, we ask you to refer the dispute at issue to some intelligent umpires, who shall settle the matter before them. We do not want to interfere with diplomatists, if they can settle the dispute without referring to us; but we say we are tired and disgusted with the old mode of calling in men with swords by their sides, and bayonets over their shoulders, to decide such matters, which should be left to reason and justice.

Now, we bring the diplomatists of the world—the governments of the civilized world—to this issue with us: Will you have war, or will you have arbitration? We say, you tell us you are as much opposed to war as we; you deride us as children running up and down, declaring and preaching mere truisms, sentiments upon which all the world are agreed. Well, then, we say, if we are agreed, will you support our plan to settle those disputes which may be raised between nations, and which your own diplomatists have taken in hand to settle themselves? It is done in private life continually. Why, scores and hundreds of British acts of Parliament have been passed *requiring* that such disputes should be settled by arbitration. The members of our Houses of Parliament do not doubt the possibility of *individuals* finding the means of subjecting private matters to arbitration; and I say plainly, the principle you find good for individuals in every case without exception, you will find good for nations; because, never let it be forgotten that the intercourse of nations is the intercourse of individuals, that the interest of nations are the interests of individuals in the aggregate; and you cannot find a better plan in dealing with nations than that which is found successful in dealing with the intercourse of individuals.

I say, it is not necessary we should have a tribunal erected to assert in all cases measures of arbitration; for when you have come to that point (I am now speaking to diplomatists) — where you cannot settle a dispute, we hold you responsible for referring that dispute to arbitration; and if you tell us—you, indeed, whom we pay so well, whom we pay so largely for your trouble; and I speak now in the name of the people—if you tell us that you cannot find the means of referring the dispute to the arbitration of reasonable individuals that are living in different parts of the world—if you tell us that you cannot find a Humboldt in Germany, a Bancroft in America, or a Lamartine in France, capable of adjusting a dispute which hinges upon a question of etiquette, or a matter of a few thousand pounds—if you cannot find means of adjusting such a matter without calling upon us, or after looking about you for arbitrators—I say, make way, gentlemen, for some other diplomatists who will do the work of the nations of the world, for which you are so well paid, in a more workmanlike manner.

Find me, in America or England, a few resolute, persevering men of principle, having hold of a principle, and capable of teaching the justice of it; and I will tell them the way they can force their governments to carry out the great principle. When you find your governments coming before you with the details of a dispute which they have raised with some other country, and which has resulted in a blockade, or in something very like a war, then call that government, or their diplomatists, to account when they trouble you to settle their accounts by a resort to physical force. Call them to account when they have not settled that matter by arbitration; and if your governments have had occasion to deal with weaker governments than themselves—weaker governments which may have applied for arbitration, because you are stronger than they, and may have sought for reason and for justice—if your governments, when America or England have blockaded

the coasts of Portugal, or the coasts of Greece—then I say, visit these governments, visit these diplomatists, with the greatest amount of displeasure; remove them far from you as an atonement for their mistakes. That is the course I am prepared to take in my country. I ask the American citizens to do the same thing; and I beg to tell them that, if they do their duty in this respect, they will not find fifteen ships of war sent out to Portugal to obtain a debt of six hundred pounds.

I am referring now to what is past—I must say a word about the future. I have seen when a government has made a false step, has refused arbitration, and has striven to oppress a weaker power—I have seen one party over whom the power of custom is greater than reason, back up that government; but at the same time I have seen, with infinite satisfaction, that another party, constrained by a sense of justice, and believing that a new spirit, a new principle, has taken birth in England, have risen up and told us that we should have a jury of nations, one half of them foreigners, and the other half of them Englishmen, so that the case may not be prejudged, or reason overcome; and that we may not assert to ourselves the right of settling our own quarrels by an appeal to force, that the weakness of another state may be overcome. Both in the House of Commons and in the House of Lords, this party has taken up the question; and I say, let us, at all events, establish this principle, whether other nations seek it or not—let us be the first to offer a measure of justice. Can you find anything better? Is there any one here who would prefer war to arbitration? If not, let us offer justice instead of war; and I repeat, if our rulers will not do so, let us repudiate and overthrow that government.

I say, we have progress in England; but I must also add that I have seen progress since mixing with this assembly. Among the visitors to-day is a stranger of considerable distinction, whom I little expected to meet at a Peace Congress; but it shows these principles are making way even among the heads of military power. The last great Peace meeting I attended in England, I found myself side by side with General Klapka, and now I find myself almost shoulder to shoulder with General Haynau. Now, I really begin to think, when we see the two leading generals, who were recently opposed to each other, coming to Peace meetings and Peace Congresses, I take this as a sign of progress, of that progress which is safe and sure, when founded upon those principles which have been laid down at the meeting to-day, founded upon the common interests and the common humanity of all living men. When I came up the Rhine, I saw what you have all seen, where the two great rivers unite their waters, a turbid stream falling down into the brighter blue of the other, resisting for a time the destruction of its distinguishing characteristic. I thought of the progress of the Peace principle. Although the different nations of Europe have distinctions of religion and of language, of habits and of instincts, yet, like these rivers, they have all one common origin, and one common destiny, and one common Creator. They, therefore, tend to one common end, to one common Father, to the same ocean of eternity. Yes! I have no doubt that their ultimate destiny is to unite and mingle in one common stream, and to present themselves before the world in one undistinguishable body.

DISARMAMENT.—The questions which we have met to discuss are not one, but several. We have been talking of war; we are now talking of Peace—that is, what the world insists upon calling Peace. I call it not peace, but an armed truce. I am not sure that our enormous standing armaments in time of peace are not a greater reflection on, and disgrace to, humanity, than even a state of war; for in a state of war there is this excuse, that a man has wound himself up to a state of moral madness—into a state of furious passion—which offers some excuse if he makes a brute of

himself, and resorts to brutal means to gain his end. But that human beings, with peace upon their lips, should be continually fortifying and increasing their armaments, argues that they have such an opinion of their fellow-men as to suppose that the whole civilized world has little confidence in each other, and have given themselves over to injustice and wrong. I say that this latter state of things is more to our dishonour than a state of war itself. War is necessarily self-destructive — it wears itself out; but where is this armed peace to end? It is a false struggle to maintain civilization. It is as dangerous to the very existence of a government as it is to the liberty of a people.

Why, we are worse than the Red Indians. I see before me a gentleman representing the Indian tribes of America. We have black men here, and red men, and white men; and we are thus, I think, in a fair way of seeing our principles prevail among all races of men. But the friend who comes here from America you will have the opportunity of listening to by-and-bye, and of learning from his talents and accomplishments, how capable that interesting but injured race is of taking part in the intelligent movements of civilized men. It will inspire you with hope for the future for the aborigines of America, and fill you with sentiments of shame for the wrongs inflicted upon that people. But what is the custom of the red Indians of America? Why, when they make peace, they bury the hatchet; and it is dug up again only when war begins. But what did this Indian chieftain see in England? He paid a visit to the Arsenal in Woolwich; and there, in a time of peace, he saw all the resources of the most inveterate war — yes, in the thirty-fifth year of peace, the implements and machinery of the most destructive carnage! I say, then, so far as these permanent standing armaments are concerned, we present ourselves before the world as greater savages than even the North American Indian tribes.

Before I came here, I prepared myself with some statistics, showing the vast amount of expenditure incurred for these armaments, the number of men engaged in them, and their great resources; but I have had put into my hand a letter addressed to the members of this Congress about these matters, from an authority of the highest character — no other than Baron von Reden, the most eminent statistician of Germany; not a letter of adhesion to this Congress—for he does not think we are sufficiently practical to gain our ends—but a letter very full of figures. We have him here among us as an auditor; and here is his letter (presenting it), and I find it is such a perfect one, that he takes my own figures out of my hand. Now, he says that the number of men employed for military purposes, both by sea and land, in Europe at this moment, is not less than four millions. The population of Europe, he calculates, is 267,000,000, of which 128,120,000 are males. Of this number he calculates those between twenty and thirty-three years of age; and taking away those who are unfit for service, one-half of the remainder, the flower of the people, are engaged in warlike purposes. Now, he next says that the average value of a year's labor may be taken at £9, and thus by taking away four millions of men from their ordinary occupation, the loss of produce would be £36,000,000 sterling. To this he adds certain amounts paid in connection with the same loss, making a total of £117,150,000, or nearly one-third the amount of all the budgets of the European governments. The expenses of war during the last thirty years have been £243,500,000, and with one-third of this sum might be constructed all the railways which are now in these countries.

Now, it is sometimes asked of the men of Peace, What is the use of your assembling at Frankfort, or Paris, or Brussels? Why, we assemble, in order that we may do what a watchman does at night, when anything goes wrong, — sound the tocsin, and awaken the sleepers. And if we have done nothing more than to elicit from Baron von Reden this valuable letter,

I for one shall be most perfectly satisfied. I think he has very much understated the costs of these armaments—he has put down, for instance, the value of a man's labor, on the average, at £9 per year; and this I think is very much understated. The costs to governments are also very much understated; but I would rather see these sums put down under than over the real amount; and besides, I would rather have the opinion of one who is not a member of the Congress, than of any one who is in it.

But though Baron von Reden does not join us, he concludes his letter by admonishing the Governments of Europe concerning the very great danger in which the war-system has placed them—danger, let me say, not exactly of that character which might at first be supposed, as if it came from bloodshed. No, it is financial danger. We have ourselves in England been continually increasing our armaments since 1821. I had the honor of an interview with the eminent statistician to whom I allude; and he agreed with me, at that interview, in saying that since 1821 the whole of Europe had added more than ever to their military establishments. He agrees with me in my own calculation, that Europe has 500,000 more armed men than at the last war—than during the time that Napoleon was at the highest point of his military renown. The Government must be mocking us.

And what have diplomatists been doing? It is just here that I begin to lose my temper. When I think of the way that these diplomatists have been preaching amity and peace—and doing this with the most solemn invocation, beginning with the most solemn oath which can be uttered, “in the name of the Holy Trinity,” and at the same moment of time going on to raise new fortifications and multiply military power—I say, when I think of this, I lose my patience with them. We meet in this place—we have called together this great Congress, to show the diplomatists and the Governments of Europe the results of this state of things.

First, they laugh at us as if we were impracticable in all our plans; they taunt us with having no “practical principle.” But we point to these facts, and say:—It is for you, gentlemen, to find plans; or, if you do not, to make way for others. Now, the argument of these would-be practical men is, We cannot diminish our armaments, because other notions don't. Well, would not diplomacy be well employed, if it would exert itself with all governments to agree to mutual disarmament—to come together and say, We are both augmenting our fortresses, we are mutually adding to our burdens, we are increasing the financial difficulties and troubles of all our states; would it not be wiser, at this time, to agree to a *pro rata* reduction? I would call this common sense—neither impolitic nor Utopian.

I could satisfy the most inveterate red-tapist in the world that it has been done, and may be done again. We have a treaty of this kind in existence between England and the United States. After 1815, England and the United States entered into a compact, by which both parties consented to reduce the number of armed vessels each country should respectively keep on the lakes which separate Canada from America. It was carried out; and on Lake Erie only one vessel of each nation was left, another on Lake Ontario, and another on Lake Michigan. And now mark the result. Instead of these Governments building new armaments, so as to violate this mutual agreement to disarm, from the moment the treaty was signed, all jealousy seemed to have fled. And after some little inquiry into the matter, I have been unable to find anything more left on these lakes which divide the two countries than an old useless vessel belonging to our own nation. The fact is, from the moment you sign a treaty of this kind, from that moment virtual disarmament begins.

I want to know why something like this should not be attempted by the diplomatists of England. Let them try. I have again and again said, let

them try, and I will forgive them if they do not succeed. Yes, let them try, and I will pay them as handsomely for their services as they now are paid — and if they do not succeed, I will never say a word to their discredit. I call this generous and liberal treatment. Because they won't do so, we are troubled with mutual jealousies, and we are devoured by taxation, and threatened with bankruptcy, with the change of Governments, with the breaking-up of states.

A friend of mine in Paris, M. Bastiat, a Frenchman of much influence, and of considerable information, and whose absence from this Congress is to be regretted, has just sent me a letter, and in this letter he uses an expression which I cannot quote without giving the authority. He says, "The ogre war costs as much for his digestion as for his meals." But we are told, in certain quarters, that the enormous amount of money necessary to keep up armaments is paid, not for protecting a country from foreign invasion, but to preserve internal security. What, then, is the meaning of those gigantic fleets which sail about the seas of Europe? England spends from six to seven millions sterling on these fleets, and France forty-five millions of francs; and this is just that system which creates mutual distrust among nations, and for that reason ought we to call upon diplomatists to set them aside. And if the people find that diplomatists will not do so, then let the people become their own diplomatists.

But, talking about internal tranquillity, I am aware that we touch upon rather delicate ground, as we are told of the necessity of preserving the lives and the property of a community. I am glad, however, that the question has been introduced, because we are bound to see that our views are well understood. I believe that there is not one of the Peace party, not even among the members of the Society of Friends, who would leave life and property at the mercy of any infatuated scoundrel or blackguard who should come and make himself free with both. We avow that we have no such intention; and, having made such an avowal, let no one take upon himself to declare that we have no wish to maintain tranquillity and peace.

Now comes the question, 'What sort of a government must that be where you require one hundred thousand men to preserve the peace?' Can it last long? And here I agree with that eloquent gentleman who has spoken to us lately, that the people can have no liberty where there is so much military power. Yes, I am thankful to hear an authority so high as that of M. Girardin, with that freedom of speech which so becomes him, that liberty cannot prevail where there is half-a-million of armed men. We do not come here to interfere with the diplomatic plans of any country. We come to announce great principles; and one gentleman has told us that a standing army of ten thousand men is found sufficient to preserve the peace of a territory (the United States) nearly as large as the whole of Europe, and a territory, let us keep in mind, which is surrounded by what are called savage and barbarous nations, and within which are minds, many of them, more savage still. In England, our liberties began only with the downfall of its standing army. After the armed tyranny in the times of the Stuarts and of Cromwell had passed away, then liberty dawned upon the nation. And at the Revolution of 1688, it was adopted as a fundamental axiom, that standing armies were illegal and inconsistent with freedom; and for one hundred years afterwards the great towns of our land could not boast of a single barrack or a soldier, except the arsenals of Portsmouth and Dover might be included in the account. Then a great orator declared — Chatham — and Chatham, mind you, was no Reformer, no Red-Republican — Chatham declared, "From the moment you erect a barracks in the neighborhood of your large towns, from that moment farewell to the liberties of England!" The wars of the

French Republic came, and these wars not only placed Europe under military subjection, but raised up forts and fortifications all over England, and we became a great fighting people, and have ever since, whether in peace or in war, been gradually raising the powers of military defence, and increasing the army. We have now 120,000 men equipped — to be sure, spread all over the world, for we have forty colonies to keep; but we have what our ancestors would not for a moment have tolerated — we have barracks in the neighborhood of all our large towns.

Now, I wish to draw the attention of the people of England, as far as I have the privilege of speaking to them, to this fact, that you cannot have freedom and self-government unless you have also a spirit of order and tranquillity pervading all classes. I do not come here to flatter the people, any more than to flatter governments and princes. The people have been more flattered than either governments or princes, and very much to their injury. I tell the people, that if they want to do away with armies, they must imbibe the spirit of order; for, if they have not this spirit, and get into confusion, they are too apt to borrow the weapons of despotic power, and to cut short the liberty of those who disagree with them. While we preach these doctrines, while we proclaim that standing armies and increasing armaments are inconsistent with human liberty, and while we proclaim the policy of abolishing armed power, we also declare, that it can be accomplished only by the people becoming capable of self-government, and of preserving order.

I am aware that at these meetings on the Continent, we are treading upon delicate ground — ground which is difficult and dangerous; but I do think the Governments of Europe have as much reason as the tax-payers to thank us for our visits. The real danger of European Governments is not in war. I was told, two years ago, that there was danger of a European war. No one tells me that now. That is not the danger; the danger everywhere is financial. 'How can we get more money?' is the outcry. They can get money at this time, because there have been one or two good harvests; but does any man, with a head upon his shoulders, and who finds himself worthy to take a place in the government of a country — does any such man think that the Governments of Europe could be maintained with two successive bad harvests, such as those which come in a cycle of every ten years? No! this event would plunge the whole of Europe again into the vortex of revolution. This is what I think every body must admit; and when I see in the time of good harvests throughout the world, the Governments neglecting to lay in a store for the future — neglecting to lay up corn in the land of Egypt — I cannot help thinking of the old chancellor who said, 'Go forth, my son, and see with what little wisdom the world is governed.' We, however, go forth on our own mission — we go forth to rouse the mind of nations on this question.

I think nothing of the taunts with which we are molested. I have always been laughed at for having some Utopia in my head; but I have always made the discovery that whatever is founded in justice and reason, must prevail. I have lived long enough to see that those who cry out with so much boldness against our principles, and who arraign them with the highest acrimony, have not much confidence in the truth of their own system, and may be found hard by, listening to what we have got to say, while they look in their terror not unlike that child who made a disturbance at night in passing through the churchyard, to frighten away the ghosts of his own imagination. No two men of France could have been picked out more ably qualified for the task of proclaiming the principle — no two men better than M. Girardin, the editor of the most eminent journal on the Continent, and M. Cormenin, one of the ablest and most spirited of writers. We have also met here a great host of German professors, and one who has

just spoken to you from America, Dr. Hitchcock, and a more eminent geologist cannot be found. He has told us that the Germans are in the habit of going to the foundation of great principles in religion and in morals, in science and in literature — that the German mind plunges to the bottom of every subject. Who, then, could be better adapted for great designs and for great purposes? Give them time. Next time when we come, they will be all on our side.

We have entered upon this movement at a moment of great difficulty, at a moment when we are likely to be subjected to the greatest possible tests; and those who are inclined to ridicule, tell us we are going over Europe amid fortifications and encampments, and telling people to disarm. I do not see any reason why we should not do so. Nations are ruining themselves with it, and we come forth to tell them to do so no longer. But we experience this difficulty in Germany, that it has been the scene of events to which we must not allude — and I shall only allude to them to say, 'Brethren, be of good heart, and do not despair' — and we find the Germans deeply interested in a great question connected with their own locality. I will only say on this point, that I would have the Germans do to others as they would be done by themselves, and leave other people to manage their own affairs themselves. But we have nevertheless received, both from Germany and France, a great amount of sympathy, and the weaker powers naturally look upon our principles as a safeguard to be preserved from the dominancy of the stronger.

And I wish to show to the stronger powers that they have as much interest in this question as the weaker; for as long as their old policy is pursued, so long will their own difficulties multiply. Can they suppose the possession of enormous military power will prevent revolution? In 1847 I went through all the courts of Europe, with the exception of that of the Pope; and I found kings everywhere dressed in regimentals, and their ante-rooms filled with soldiers, and their fortifications well replenished with troops. 1848 came, and all over the Continent, as I have said before, thrones tumbled like a house of cards. I, therefore, can appeal to governments and kings, as well as tax-payers and the people, to help a cause that will bless and benefit them all. And I say, if any of them have no hopes that we will do any good — if they admit our principle is true, and don't join us because they doubt our success — I will say that I would be sorry to entertain such hopes of humanity as to be driven to despair of anything being done for the peace of nations, the welfare of governments, and the happiness of man.

This last speech of Mr. Cobden is the only one which seems to have been reported with any tolerable degree of fullness or directness. It is much to be regretted that all the other debates were not presented in the same direct, life-like style; for the mere abstracts given, as well as the applause with which many of them were received by the Congress, proved that they must have possessed not a little of both argument and eloquence worthy of preservation. Such speeches were made by a considerable number of able and distinguished men from various countries. Dr. MADONAO, Professor in Cassali, Piedmont; M. LEDDERSTEDT, from Sweden, lately Consul at the Cape of Good Hope; JOSEPH GARNIER, M. COQUEREL, and others, from Paris; Rev. L. BONNET, Dr. WEIL, Dr. BODENSTEDT, Dr. SPIESS, with others, from Germany, and among them Rev. M. STEIN, a Jewish Rabbi of Frankfort; M. VISSCHERS, and Prof. LAURENT from Belgium; M. DRUCKER, from Holland; CHARLES HINDLEY, M. P., LAWRENCE

HEYWORTH, M. P., REV. EDWARD MIALI, JOSEPH STURGE, REV. HENRY RICHARD, REV. EDWARD STOKES, &c., from England; GEORGE COPWAY, the Indian Chief, as representative of his red brethren in America; REV. E. B. HALL, D. D., REV. PRESIDENT HITCHCOCK, D. D., LL. D., REV. E. H. CHAPIN, REV. ARTEMAS BULLARD, D. D., REV. F. W. HOLLAND, Prof. C. D. CLEVELAND, and some others from the United States. Here is a long array of names; and as not only all these, but others spoke, there must have been quite a free and full interchange of views, if not a thorough discussion of the whole subject before them. From the meagre abstracts of their speeches, contained in the report before us, we shall give only a few extracts more, though with much regret that the entire proceedings could not have been reported with a degree of fullness which would have done something like justice to the respective speakers, and to the Congress itself.

A JEW'S PROTEST AGAINST STANDING ARMIES. — When the resolution in favor of disarmament was before the Congress, Rabbi STEIN in seconding it said: — I thank God that he has permitted me, the teacher of God's oldest revelation, to live to this day to address this large and honorable assembly. Could our persecuted fathers rise from their graves, and hear the precious word 'Peace,' they would extend the hand to this union, formed of all the nations of the earth. Now that the ark of thought has come to rest on the top of the Ararat of our time, will we send out the dove of peace. Germany may at this moment have no voice to raise for the aim for which we strive, but do not believe on that account that her sympathies are not with us. Germany, whose fields have been so often heaped up with the bloody bodies of her children, Germany cheers you on.

A people that arms against itself, appears to me like a man who plants himself before a mirror, and strikes his own reflection. The standing army is perilous to freedom within and without. Not only government, but also representative assemblies, are called to abolish the policy of an armed peace. Peace, at any price, the Cabinets demand. Abolition of standing armies, at any price, is the cry of the people. Let the iron of the hills be no more converted into instruments of murder to divide the people; let it be forged into rails for roads which might connect distant countries. Let it be said of this age as it was of Franklin. — "Eripuit cœlo fulmen, sceptrumque tyrannis:" — "From heaven he wrested the lightning, from tyrants the sceptre." Never do I look upon the panting engine on the railway, vomiting forth its steam, but I think of the cloudy pillar by day, and the fiery pillar by night. I second the resolution with all my heart.

ANSWER TO THE CHARGE OF UTOPIANISM. — EDWARD MIALI, of London, editor of the *Nonconformist*. — He was convinced that if there was one class of persons whom more than another it behooved society to put down to their proper level of insignificance, it was your self-styled practical men. He did not mean those who, having a notion in their heads, set themselves rudely about the task of working it out, but those who arrogated to themselves the title as emphatically, if not exclusively, descriptive of themselves, and whose only mode of proving their right to it, was that of recommending, in relation to all great philanthropic movements, that nothing should be done.

These men are a numerous class, and it would be well to describe their characteristics. They know no difference between a difficulty and an impossibility. In relation to every grand attempt to elevate and spiritualize humanity, they move as snails with their home of comfort and reputation on their backs, and with horns protruding a long way before them, in or-

der to have timely notice of obstacles — which, whenever they desery, as they cherish no particular attachment to any particular principle, they simply turn back, and take another path. These persons, while others are giving battle, like Bunyan's Greatheart to the Giant Despair, are employed in setting still, wringing their hands, and predicting failure; but the moment the foe is laid prostrate, they are sure to step forward to have a hit at Mrs. Diffidence, and to claim the largest share of the honors reaped by the triumph. Never did noble-hearted men band together to pioneer a way through the dense jungles of human ignorance and depravity, but these practical men, like guats, assemble in swarms to sing their little monotonous, tiny song of discouragement — to give utterance to some cant cry about impracticability and Utopianism, and to cavil at what is out of their power either to retard or to destroy.

I am sick of the class, and of their self-complacent pretensions; and I think it a reflection upon the intelligence and manliness of the age, that such men in houses of legislature, and in the press, continue to exercise so much influence. I would point to a better specimen of a really practical man. He who said 'let me but make the songs of the people, and I will leave who will to make their laws,' was thoroughly practical. He knew human nature, and how to deal with it. He saw in it something more than machinery, and made his approaches to it accordingly. That is the plan on which we are acting. We believe that the best method of putting an end to war, is to assail the false sentiments out of which war arises,— and we make our appeal to the intelligence and the conscience of the various civilized peoples of Europe and America, certain that if our principle is a right one, our efforts in this direction cannot be lost.

The resolution before us points to non-intervention on the ground that it is for the interest of states to be self-regulated. I am an ardent friend of the principle of *self-regulation*. That is the key-principle of my creed. I insist upon its superior efficacy, not merely in relation to states, but to individuals.

Rev. HENRY RICHARD, Secretary of the London Peace Society, closed his remarks, which were mainly on other topics, mostly of a business nature, with the following: — In regard to the general question, I will say but few words. We have been admonished again and again that we and our Congress would be the objects of much ridicule and laughter. Be it so. We were most unworthy to espouse a cause so sacred and angust, if we had not laid our account with meeting the sneers of the frivolous and the interested, which are, and always have been, directed against all large and generous ideas, when first announced to the world. My answer to the sneerers is this: if there be any who think that it is a rational thing for intelligent beings to try to establish right by violence, let such laugh! If there be any who think that it is a pleasant thing to have fathers torn from the bosom of their families, and sons from their parents' arms, and sent forth and shot and slaughtered like dogs, and left weltering in their blood, to perish abandoned and succorless on the battle-field, let such laugh! If there be any who think that it is a wise and politic thing for nations to stand in the presence of each other in an attitude of mutual menace and defiance, and in order to maintain that attitude, suffering themselves to be burdened with enormous standing armies, which consume their resources worse than a plague of locusts, let such laugh! If there be any who think that it is an honorable thing to the philosophy and enlightenment of the nineteenth century, that its entire system of civilization should be made to rest, not on intelligence, not on liberty, not on religion, but upon brute force in its coarsest and most brutal form, let such laugh! If there be any who think that it is a holy and religious thing for those nations that, by

way of emphasis, call themselves the nations of Christendom, to be seen in the presence of heathens and barbarians, tearing each other like wolves, —if there be any who think all this, let such laugh. But for us, who think the reverse of all this, we will tell the sneerers that, grounded as are our exertions on the most sacred and earnest convictions, we will not permit ourselves to be turned one hair's breadth out of the straight path along which we pursue our object, though all the wits in Christendom were to laugh in chorus.

As to the ultimate success of our efforts, my faith is strong. May I be permitted, for the sake of an illustration, to make one personal allusion? Last year, after the Congress at Paris, greatly exhausted in body and mind partly by ill health, and partly by the labor and fatigue I had endured in connection with that assembly, I retired to a small sea-port town in my native country of Wales to enjoy a little rest and relaxation. I remember well one day, while oppressed with that despondency which is produced by ill health and reaction after great excitement, I was gazing into the harbor, and saw a large vessel deeply imbedded in the mud that had been left as a sediment by the retiring tide. What an enormous amount of mechanical force, thought I to myself, would be necessary to lift this huge ship from this spot, and carry it to yonder ocean. By what means can it be removed from its sunken bed? While I was yet meditating, I beheld the first faint rippling wavelet of the returning tide steal along, and gently laving the keel of the vessel. And is it possible, I thought, that an agent so feeble can ever succeed in moving it from its place? But I continued to watch, and saw the waters increasing and swelling, until in about an hour I beheld the whole of that mighty mass, with its wood and iron and rigging, tossed like a feather on the top of the wave; and in the course of the evening, I saw it with spreading canvas, going forth from the harbor, and borne onward grandly and gallantly towards its destination, on the bosom of the waters. Yes, I said to my own faithless and desponding heart, I will accept this as a symbol. The cause of permanent and universal peace lies thus stranded and sunk in the foul mud of prejudices, left behind by centuries of violence and blood.

And how is this to be removed? Not by mechanical force of any kind, but by the power of an enlightened public opinion; feeble at the first as the rippling wavelet I saw an hour ago, kissing the keel of that vessel. But the waters are rising. I hear already the deep, murmuring sound of their approach; and they will continue to rise, and expand, and swell in bulk and volume, until the noble vessel shall be fairly lifted from its place. Yes, I do not despair to live to see the time, (and in that confidence I will return and take my humble place among the crew,) when it shall go forth with outspread sails on the broad ocean, having flying at its mast head, not the Union-jack of England, nor the American stars and stripes, nor the tricolor of France, not even the symbol of the United German nation, which is ever waving around and above us here, but something better, holier than any or all of these,—the broad banner of universal humanity, having inscribed upon it, as a motto, that sublime utterance of divine love, "God hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth."

NON-INTERVENTION. — On this topic, to which the closing paragraph of Mr. Miall's speech alludes, we quote an abstract of the two most distinguished members of the Congress,—its President, and Mr. Cobden.

HERR JAUP.—The principle of non-intervention has generally prevailed in Germany. The Congress of Pillnitz, in 1791, first gave the occasion of acknowledging the right of intervention, and war was the consequence. The same evil occurred again two years afterwards. In 1830, when the

movement broke out in Italy, the right of intervention was again proclaimed; but England then declared against it, and recognized that right only in cases in which its own interests were concerned. The same principle was again proclaimed in 1833. In Germany, the professors of law pronounced themselves against intervention. The German confederation was signed, as the Congress of 1815, under the express condition: that the foreign powers had no right of intervention in Germany, and the German Diet proclaimed against the principle by a decree in 1834.

MR. COBDEN. — This is the only resolution which has raised much dispute; and no wonder, for Germany is under difficult circumstances, and no doubt sees that England herself has violated right principles of intervention. One reason for the adoption of such a motion is, that it is generally found where nations interfere with their neighbors very much, they manage their own affairs very badly. I think the great countries of Europe who meddle with weaker powers, should take a lesson from the weaker powers about the way of conducting business at home. That would not be a bad thing. The golden maxim is, that we should do to others as we would be done by; and to carry out that maxim, the Congress know no party, whether a great power or a weak power. They came together to advance the principles of truth and justice.

But it is said no absolute principle of non-intervention can be established. They may point out an instance where an exception would be taken to the general principle, and with apparent good results. But what is the effect? Once break through a great principle, and the door is opened for all kinds of disorder. By breaking through a great principle no security exists against universal disorder.

And we are told another thing, — ‘if you don’t interfere, some other states will.’ When arguing another question, which I will not allude to now, it was said to me, ‘it is all very well to carry out that principle of trade, if you can get other nations to do the same.’ I replied, ‘If you have a sound principle, carry it out fully, as you know not the good you may gain by it — you know not how many other countries may follow your example.’ If France, and England, and the United States, I am bold to say, would join together, and make an absolute principle of non-intervention, and would keep it for five years, neither Austria nor Russia would interfere. Without turning, therefore, to any corner of Europe, where commotion is going on, I may safely say we are acting for the interests of the weak, as well as the strong in this matter. I speak for myself, as a citizen of England; and I have no hesitation in saying to my German friends, that when I hold up my hand for non-intervention in Germany, I mean to do the same in England; I would hold up that hand against intervention everywhere, when both parties do not mutually solicit it.

WAR LOANS. — M. DRUCKER of Amsterdam, said he came from Holland, where, next to England, loans were most in repute. He was of opinion that the distribution of twenty-five thousand millions in stocks among the various nations, was a powerful guarantee for peace, although the people were oppressed to raise the cost of national debts and the standing armies, the bane of our age. He called attention to the fact that in those countries which were the most largely concerned in these stocks, reforms progress in a constitutional manner, as in England, Holland and Belgium; while the contrary was the case in countries without credit, like Greece and Spain. He indulged in some very severe reflections on the dishonesty of Spain towards her creditors. The friends of peace were bound to endeavor to reduce the national debts generally, and also to compel all Governments to fulfil their engagements, though not at the cannon’s mouth, as

was Lord Palmerston's plan. For carrying out the objects of the Congress, funds were necessary; and for these one should apply to the holders of governmental security, because these are the most interested in the preservation of peace. If for every one hundred florins only one cent were given, the sum realized would be very considerable. He believed that he could promise from Holland alone the influence of five hundred millions of capital.

M. GIRARDIN reminded the Congress of the old proverb, "Money is the sinews of war." It was true that certain of the democratic party were of opinion that war was the only means by which they could regain their lost liberties; but how much better would it be to apply the money to useful purposes! To carry on war, they came to them for money, and then for more money, and then for more still. They had only to refuse the money, and they made war impossible. No loan, no war. That man must be branded with disgrace who would at all assist such a bloody purpose.

DUELLING. — M. CORMENIN. — Duelling is war. It is the petty war between man and man, instead of the grand war between nation and nation. There is no other difference but of proportion. When, therefore, we renounce and condemn war between communities as contrary to duty, virtue, reason, humanity, we preclude whatever besides frustrates all the obligations expressed in those words. For the Congress of Peace to allow the admissibility of duelling, would be to deserve more ridicule than any of its opposers have been able to cast upon it. No! the murderous conflict between individuals must cease like that of nations. Gentlemen of the Peace Congress, yours will be the honor of having accomplished that from which parliaments themselves have shrunk from attempting. You have become in this assembly the first representatives of civilization, the first great assembly which in the name of reason, religion, and morals, has condemned duellists; and to place your theories in practice, has excluded them from your midst.

M. GIRARDIN, (who once gave a mortal wound in a duel with M. Armand Carrel,) said,—Duelling is war between individuals. We here give a guarantee to obtain credit, and that guarantee is to be found in the solemnity of our acts—that guarantee is to deny duelling publicly and openly. A legislative assembly has, at this moment, as subject for future debate, a law upon duelling. In my life there is a painful reminiscence. I fought a fatal duel twenty years ago, and I still feel remorse for it at this moment. If we were to leave no other trace in Frankfort than this resolution, we might say we had done enough.

A QUESTION OF WAR-CASUISTRY. — President HITCHCOCK, of Amherst College. — He would call attention to a single point. He was conversant with many military officers, and he found they did not acknowledge a personal responsibility in the matter of war, but believed themselves to be the machines of state authority. He must say, that men were bound to yield much for the support of good order and government; but how far had a government a right to ask him to go and destroy men? There was a sanctuary into which no man had a right to enter, the sanctuary of his own conscience; and God had said, "Thou shalt not kill." He would not contend here that this prohibited government from taking life; but he would contend that when a government required him to go and destroy his neighbor, he was bound by the highest claim to ask the reasons for such a thing. But military men, he feared, acted upon the principle that they had no right to inquire whether the government commands are right or wrong. The late President of the United States said

on his death bed, "My conscience does not upbraid me." And why said he so? Because he had a military conscience; for this man had engaged in one of the most deplorable of all wars, that with Mexico.

Germany is the land of great principles, great sciences, and great deeds; and here is the place to settle great principles in science and morals. Glad was he, therefore, to stand up in Germany, and call upon its great people to settle the question of casuistry, 'Can a man, in duty to God, implicitly obey a Government in military matters?' And he would not be afraid to trust Germany in this great matter, feeling confident that the conclusion would be—Every shot that is fired, should be fired under a sense of personal responsibility, and in the view of a future judgment.

Rev. E. H. CHAPIN, of New York, was reported to have electrified the Congress with "a burst of real Yankee eloquence;" but here is the only abstract we can find of his speech:—

He would not enter upon a logical argument; all he would urge was, that war was irreligious. He wanted nothing more. This proposition was broad enough to crush any argument on the other side.

The Americans would go home to circulate the truths they had heard, and agitate for an international code. He entered upon a dissertation of the horrors of war, and showed that battles, after all, must be settled by arbitration. The simple principle which, as an American, he would utter was, 'Be sure you are right, and then go ahead.' The steam-shuttle was weaving nations together, and all things were going on to show, not how men could destroy, but create.

And would it not be a great thing, if at the great exhibition of 1851 could be exhibited the work of diplomatists? Yes, if a curtain could open, and disclose the maimed, dreadful, horrified picture of a battle-field, with its awful music of despair.

All things are tending to a great unity; and what is the fact? Why, that there is a confusion of tongues, but never did men better understand one another. Is there anything too good to be conceived possible? Let not men, then, call us wild visionaries. Nothing is too great to be realized. The printing-press stands in antagonism to superstition—to war. The man at the press, pulling off the sheets, is a picture in contrast with the walls, the mighty walls of Gibraltar and Ehrenbreitsten; but there is a voice in it which declares, 'This should conquer That.'

OMENS OF SUCCESS, OR AUXILIARIES OF PEACE.—Mr. BURRITT closed a long and able speech on a Congress of Nations, with the following paragraphs, the only fragments of it reported:—

Now, all the signs of the times that I can distinguish, indicate that this preparation is already far advanced. The morning light of the good time coming is everywhere breaking upon the eyes of those who are looking and longing for its appearing. Every where new hearts and new hopes are gained to our cause. Everywhere new agencies and tendencies are combining to propel it forward. The great necessities and interests of the age unite to make Peace the first want and predilection of the nations. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of men are coming to be recognized by civilization and science, as well as by Christianity. This great central principle of Divine revelation is taking effect upon the peoples of the world. The bristling barriers of nationality, which once divided and estranged them, are gradually disappearing, and they are beginning to fraternize across the boundaries that once made them enemies. The great transactions of nations, the mightiest works of human skill and energy, are becoming *international* in origin, operation, and ownership. Is it

a canal that is proposed? It is a great channel for the ships of all nations across the Isthmus of Panama, to connect the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and to shorten the passage to India by 6000 miles. Is it a railway that is projected? It is one 4000 miles in length, across the Continent of North America, to open to all the nations of Europe a north-west passage to China of thirty days from London. Is it an electric telegraph? It is one to reach round the globe, crossing Behring's Straits and the English Channel, and stringing on its nerve of wire all the capitals of the civilized world between London and Washington. Is it a grand display of the works of art and industry, for the encouragement and development of mechanical skill and genius? It is a magnificent exhibition opened, without the slightest distinction, to the artists and artisans of all nations, just as if they belonged to one and the same nation, and were equally entitled to its patronage and support. Is it an act affecting navigation? It is to place all the ships that plough the ocean upon the same footing as if owned by one and the same nation. Is it a proposition to cheapen and extend the facilities of correspondence between individuals and communities? It is to give the world an ocean-penny postage, to make home everywhere, and all nations neighbors.

These are the material manifestations of that idea of universal brotherhood which is now penetrating the popular mind in different countries, and preparing them for that condition promised to mankind in Divine revelation. They are the mechanical efforts of civilization to demonstrate that sublime truth — 'God hath made of one blood all nations of men.'

CLOSING ACTS.

RESOLUTIONS OF THANKS BY THE CONGRESS. — On motion of Rev. H. Richard, seconded by M. Visschers, it was unanimously and enthusiastically voted,

That the thanks of this Congress be presented —

1. To the Burgomasters and Senate of Frankfort, for the hospitable readiness with which they have granted permission to the Congress to assemble in this free city.

2. To the Frankfort Local Committee, for the admirable skill and indefatigable earnestness and activity with which they have co-operated with the English deputation in making all the necessary preparations for the Congress.

3. To the Lutheran Consistory, for their kindness in granting for the use of the Congress the magnificent building in which it has been our privilege to meet.

Next Congress. — On motion of Dr. Spiess, a member of the Frankfort Committee, seconded by M. Girardin, it was resolved, that the next Peace Congress be held at London in 1851, in connexion with the World's Industrial Exhibition.

After a vote of thanks to the President, and a succession of cheers, first to him, next for Germany, and finally for Cobden, (at the instigation of his German friends,) in all which we see the *English* mode of expressing approbation and sympathy, — the Congress adjourned *sine die*.

Vote of thanks by the British and American Delegates. — Immediately after the close of the Congress, these "passed the following resolution with the greatest enthusiasm": —

The delegates and visitors from Great Britain and the United States of America to the Peace Congress at Frankfort-on-the-Maine, present their sincere and grateful acknowledgments to the Governments of France, Belgium,

and Prussia for the various facilities afforded them in their route to the Congress, especially for the privilege of continuous transit by means of a special train, and for exemption from passports and examination of luggage. They also desire to express their sense of the cordiality with which they have been received by the people of the three countries, as well as of the courtesy shown them by the various official authorities. They record their sincere conviction that the frequent interchange of such friendly communications between different countries, is eminently calculated to maintain peace and good will among the nations of the earth.

LETTERS TO THE CONGRESS.

Letters of approval and sympathy were sent from some of the most distinguished men in Europe; but we have in this number space for brief extracts from only a few.

FROM BARON HUMBOLDT'S LETTER TO THE PEACE CONGRESS. — I regret so much the more that my personal position and advanced age, which warn me to complete what work I have commenced, should hinder me from assisting at a meeting having so noble an aim in view, as it would have afforded me the gratification of coming into close contact with so many men distinguished for talent and humanity. I have already verbally expressed this regret a few weeks ago, when I had the pleasure to see Messrs. Henry Richard and Elihu Burritt and Visschers, and to converse with them on the probable influence which your Society may hope to exercise.

The general peace which our Continent has now so long enjoyed, and the praiseworthy efforts of many governments to avert the oft-threatening dangers of a general European war, proved that the ideas which so prominently occupied your minds are in accordance with the sentiments called forth and diffused by the increased culture of humanity. It is a useful enterprise to inspire such sentiments in the commonwealth by public conferences, and at the same time to point out some way through which wise and sincere governments may, by fostering the progressive and legitimate development and perfectibility of free institutions, weaken the long accumulated elements of animosity.

How much mildness of manners, and an improved order in the organization of States have confined within narrower limits the wild outbursts of physical violence, may be seen by comparing the first and middle ages with modern times. The whole history of the past shows that, under the protection of a superior power, a long-nourished yearning after a nobler aim in the life of nations, will at length find its consummation. Has not a disgraceful legislation conniving at — yea encouraging, the infamous system of slavery, and the traffic in human beings, at least on our Continent, and in the independent States of former Spanish America, yielded to the united efforts of the better part of mankind?

We must not, then, relinquish the hope that a path will open by which all hostile divisions and contracting jealousies will gradually disappear. The whole history of the world teaches, to use the expression of a statesman long departed, 'that the idea of humanity becomes in the course of centuries even more visible, in a more enlarged acceptation, and proclaims its animating power.'

Inspired with these hopes and wishes, honored men, I beg to commend myself to your kind remembrance, &c.

ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT.

Potsdam, August 20.

ARCHBISHOP OF PARIS. — Myself, a man of peace, minister of a God who has said of himself that he was 'meek and lowly of heart,' I applaud these

efforts of the friends of Peace to establish concord on the earth, and to banish wars and divisions. This is a grand object; an object essentially Christian. We cannot yet attain it; but there is a strong tendency towards its attainment. These public manifestations, expressed by these Congresses, prepare and form opinion, which is always the queen of the world. When public opinion shall be decidedly pronounced against violence and brute force to terminate the differences which arise among nations, their rulers will be obliged to consider among themselves what to do, and wars will become more and more rare.

May God supremely bless our common efforts, and incline the hearts of the people towards gentleness and love, which are, indeed, at the foundation of all religion.

HORACE SAY. — You know with what ardor of sentiment I partake all your convictions, and associate myself with all your ideas on this subject. The more the people are enlightened, the more they comprehend political economy, the more they will learn to know the true nature of things, and the more they will be led cheerfully to obey the will of God in loving one another. We have yet much to do, and our pacific mission is far from being terminated; for the governments and the peoples appear, until now, quite sunk in the old ruts.

Tell our friends, I pray you, the mortification I feel at not finding myself among them; and receive, my dear and honorable friend, the fresh assurances of my entire devotedness.

A PEACE EMBASSY.

DR. BODENSTEDT, on behalf of the Schleswig-Holsteiners, laid before the Peace Congress at Frankfort near the close of its sessions, a request for its mediation to terminate the war, and settle the dispute, between them and Denmark. The rules of the Congress, and the *ex parte* nature of the request, forbade even a formal presentation of the subject; but three prominent members of the Congress, (Joseph Sturge, Elihu Burritt, and Frederick Wheeler,) went on their own responsibility to visit both the contending parties, in the hope of bringing about an amicable adjustment of the difficulties which have threatened even to disturb the general peace of Europe. From Hamburgh, 25th Sept., they addressed to the members of the late Peace Congress, a report of their mission, which we quote almost entire as follows: —

“Disclaiming all intention of entering on the merits of the case, we ventured, solely on our own responsibility, to proceed to the theatre of the contest, for the purpose of entreating the contending parties to refer the whole question at issue to the decision of enlightened and impartial arbitrators, and thus to spare themselves the further infliction of the calamities and horrors of a war which could never satisfactorily settle the matter in dispute, and which is contemplated with pain and sorrow by the friends of religion and humanity throughout the world.

In order to prevent any misapprehension in regard to the object of our voluntary mission, we embodied the views expressed above in a written statement,